



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,341	11/10/2003	Adriano Festa	7202-46	5158
30448	7590	11/07/2005	EXAMINER	
AKERMAN SENTERFITT			PEARSE, ADEPEJU OMOLOLA	
P.O. BOX 3188			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			1761	

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/705,341	FESTA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Adepeju Pearse	1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding the claims, the phrase "and the like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "and the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuil et al (US 6,376,004). Kuil et al disclose a soup and sauce concentrate that is ambient stable having a water activity of below 0.92 (abstract) comprising 5-65% of fat or oil, 1-35% of a flavoring composition that includes vegetables (col 1 lines 58-64, col 3 lines 7-12) and a pH preferably less than 5.0 (col 2 lines 49-59). With regard to claims 9-10, Kuil et al disclose that the

concentrated base product could be mixed/diluted with an aqueous liquid such as water, milk, cream vegetable juices etc in order to prepare a ready-to-eat finished sauce (col 3 lines 40-50). With regard to claim 11, Kuil et al disclose a sauce preparation where the ingredients comprising a flavor mix including chopped vegetables, soybean oil, water, etc were mixed and heated. The resultant product had a water activity of around 0.85, a pH of 4.7-4.8 and was microbial stable. (col 4 lines 1-43). It is inherent that the heat treatment was a mild pasteurization treatment to ensure microbial stability.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

Art Unit: 1761

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuil et al (US Pat. No. 6,376,004) in view of Ammedick-Naumann et al (US Pat. No. 6,254,918). With regard to claims 2 and 8, Kuil et al disclose a fat content of 5-65%, which encompasses applicant's recited range. However, Kuil et al failed to disclose an organoleptically characterizing ingredient in a range of 50-70%. Ammedick-Naumann et al teach a sauce aid comprising of a food grade oil, a finely divided vegetable powder containing cell wall and/or fiber (abstract) at a range of 10-50% (col 1 lines 60-62); this range encompasses applicant's recited range. The vegetable powder is not completely soluble in the water phase (col 1 lines 50-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kuil et al range with Ammedick-Naumann et al in order to improve the flavor of the soup concentrate. With regard to claim 3, Kuil et al disclose a most preferred water activity between 0.7 and 0.9; in order to increase microbial stability at ambient conditions (col 2 lines 49-52) this range encompasses applicant's recited range. With regard to claim 4, Kuil et al disclose a pH less than 5 and more preferably at least 4.0 (col 2 lines 53-56) for microbial stability. This range encompasses applicant's recited range. It would be expected that the pH would be at this level in order to improve the stability of the soup concentrate. With regard to claims 5-6, Kuil et al failed to disclose the types of edible oils incorporated in the soup concentrate. However, Ammedick-Naumann et al teach suitable food grade oils including olive oil, soybean oil, etc. Absent any clear and convincing evidence and/or

Art Unit: 1761

arguments to the contrary it would be expected that these oils have low saturated fatty acid content and Kuil et al can be modified to incorporate these oils. With regard to claim 7, Kuil et al disclose that herbs and spices can be incorporated into the soup concentrate (col 3 lines 7-10).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adepeju Pearse whose telephone number is 571-272-8560. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8.00am - 4.30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Adepeju Pearse  
Art Unit 1761

  
MILTON I. CANO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700